

double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-2 and 9 of copending Application No. 10/071,545 ("Hornsby II"). In addition, claims 5-9 were provisionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 3-4 and 6-8 of Hornsby II.

Claims 5-9 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Further, claims 1 and 5-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by prior art references. Claim 1 was rejected as anticipated by Li et al. ("Li") and claims 5-9 were rejected as anticipated by Simms or Pearson et al. ("Pearson").

Finally, claims 2-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for obviousness. Claims 2 and 10 were rejected as being unpatentable over Hongo in view of Gabai et al. ("Gabai"). Claims 2-4 and 10 were rejected as being unpatentable over Lebensfeld et al. ("Lebensfeld") in view of Mathieu et al. ("Mathieu"). Claims 3-4 were rejected as being unpatentable over Tachau et al. ("Tachau"). Claims 5-9 were rejected as being unpatentable over Simms in view of Gabai. Finally, claims 11-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lebensfeld in view of Mathieu and Li.

I. Obviousness-Type Double Patenting Rejections

Claims 1-2 and 10-11 were provisionally rejected under the doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 12-13, 33 and 43 of Hornsby I in view of Tachau. Claim 11 of the present invention has been canceled. Further, claims 1-2 and 10 were provisionally rejected under the doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-2 and 9 of Hornsby II.

Applicants would be willing to file a terminal disclaimer under 37 C.F.R. § 1.321(c) upon a finding of allowability for claims 1-2 and 10, thereby obviating the basis for the rejections. Trendmasters, Inc. is owner of 100 percent interest in the present application, Hornsby I, and Hornsby II. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

II. Statutory Double Patenting Rejection

Claims 5-9 were provisionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 3-4 and 6-8 of Hornsby II. Claim 6 of the present invention has been canceled. It is respectfully submitted that claims 5 and 7-9 do not claim the same invention as that of amended claims 3-4 and 6-8 of Hornsby II.

Claims 3-4 and 6-8 of Hornsby II have been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants of Hornsby II regard as the invention. Based on those amendments, claims 5 and 7-9 of the present invention do not claim the same invention as that of claims 3-4 and 6-8 of Hornsby II. Applicants of the present invention respectfully refer the Examiner to the amendments to claims 3-4 and 6-8 in the Amendment and Response to the Office Action of August 7, 2002 in Hornsby II. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

III. § 112 Rejections

Claims 5-9 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Claim 6 has been canceled. Claims 5, 7-9, and 12 have been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the present invention.

Applicants respectfully submit that the scope of amended claims 5 and 12 are equivalent to the claims as originally presented. The amendments were made only to comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112 and should not be interpreted to materially limit the scope of the claims and equivalents thereof.

A. Independent Claim 5 is Not Indefinite

Claim 5 was rejected as indefinite because the method step of “building a battle deck” could not be determined. Claim 5, as amended, requires compiling a number of the information carrying cards, wherein the information carrying cards carry game and control information, the control information adapted to actuate an amusement device. It is respectfully submitted that claim 5, as amended, particularly points out and distinctly claims the subject matter which Applicants regard as the present invention.

Accordingly, claim 5 stands in condition for allowance.

B. Claims Depending from Claim 5 Are Not Indefinite

Because claims 7-9 depend directly or indirectly from claim 5 and incorporate all the limitations of claim 5, the above amendment and argument obviates the basis for this ground of rejection. Thus, claims 7-9 are not indefinite. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

C. Dependent Claim 12 is Not Indefinite

Claim 12 was rejected as indefinite because the structural features encompassed by the claim could not be identified. Claim 12, as amended, is directed to an interactive amusement system wherein a number of the data cards are configured to be used in a card game. It is respectfully submitted that claim 12, as amended, particularly points out and distinctly claims the subject matter which Applicants regard as the present invention.

Accordingly, claim 12 stands in condition for allowance.

IV. § 102(b) Rejections

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Li. Claims 5-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Simms or Pearson. Claim 6 has been canceled. It is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 5, and 7-9 are not anticipated.

A. Independent Claim 1 Is Not Anticipated by Li

Claim 1, as amended, is directed to armor carried by the body and protecting at least a portion of the body, the armor adapted to be detachable during normal use of the amusement device.

As stated in the Office Action, Li discloses armor only “where it is considered that anything can be detached from something else by disassembly or simply breaking the pieces.” See Office Action, p. 5, ll. 2-3. Li does not disclose armor adapted to be detachable during normal use of the amusement device.

Li, therefore, fails to disclose armor adapted to be detachable during normal use. Accordingly, claim 1 stands in condition for allowance.

B. Independent Claim 5 Is Not Anticipated by Simms or Pearson

Claim 5, as amended, requires compiling a number of the information carrying cards, wherein the information carrying cards carry game and control information, the control information adapted to actuate an amusement device, and players using the game information against each other to try to achieve victory over other players.

In contrast to the present invention, Simms discloses wrestling images on playing cards to be sequentially displayed in a match between competitors and an apparatus for displaying those same images. That is, Simms discloses only game information. Simms does not disclose control information.

Also in contrast to the present invention, Pearson discloses a card element containing player input data that can be supplied to a software-based control system and also functioning as a trading card. That is, Pearson discloses only control information for actuating a control system for a software-based game. Pearson does not disclose separate game information. Neither reference discloses information carrying cards that carry game and control information wherein the game information is used by players against each other to try to achieve victory and the control information is adapted to actuate an amusement device.

Simms and Pearson, therefore, fail to disclose information carrying cards carrying game and control information, the control information adapted to actuate an amusement device, and players using the game information against each other to try to achieve victory over other players. Accordingly, claim 5 stands in condition for allowance.

C. Claims Depending from Claim 5 Are Patentable

Because claims 7-9 depend directly or indirectly from claim 5 and incorporate all the limitations of claim 5, the above argument obviates the basis for this ground of rejection. Thus, claims 7-9 are not anticipated by Simms or Pearson. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

V. § 103(a) Rejections

Claims 2 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hongo in view of Gabai. Claims 2-4 and 10 were rejected as being unpatentable over Lebensfeld in view of Mathieu. Claims 3-4 were rejected as being unpatentable over Tachau. Claims 5-9 were rejected as being unpatentable over Simms in view of Gabai. Finally, claims 11-12 were rejected as being unpatentable over Lebensfeld in view of Mathieu and Li.

Claims 6 and 11 have been canceled. It is respectfully submitted that claims 2-5, 7-10, and 12 are not obvious.

A. Independent Claim 2 Is Not Made Obvious by Hongo in View of Gabai

Claim 2, as amended, is directed to a transforming interactive amusement device having a card reader associated with the body.

Hongo teaches a game apparatus having three-dimensional toy bodies, a game machine, and a monitor for displaying characters corresponding to the toy bodies. A central processing unit decodes data from robot parts and provides data communication with a cartridge unit. Hongo does not teach or suggest a card reader associated with the body.

Gabai fails to remedy the deficiencies of Hongo. The reference discloses a wireless computer controlled toy. Gabai fails to teach or suggest a card reader.

Neither of the references, alone or in combination, teach or suggest, provide any motivation or expectation of success to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide an amusement device having a card reader associated with the body. Neither of the references, alone or in combination, teach or suggest a card reader. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would find no motivation or expectation of success in the cited references, alone or in combination, to provide an amusement device having a card reader.

B. Independent Claim 10 Is Not Made Obvious by Hongo in View of Gabai

Claim 10, as amended, is directed to an interactive amusement device having a data card reader adapted to receive data from a data card.

Hongo teaches a game apparatus having three-dimensional toy bodies, a game machine, and a monitor for displaying characters corresponding to the toy bodies. A central processing unit decodes data from robot parts and provides data communication with a cartridge unit. Hongo does not teach or suggest a data card reader or a data card.

Gabai fails to remedy the deficiencies of Hongo. The reference discloses a wireless computer controlled toy. Gabai fails to teach or suggest a data card reader or a data card.

Neither of the references, alone or in combination, teach or suggest, provide any motivation or expectation of success to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide an amusement device having a card reader or a data card. Neither of the references, alone or in combination, teach or suggest a card reader or a data card. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would find no motivation or expectation of success in the cited references, alone or in combination, to provide an amusement device having a card reader or a data card.

C. Independent Claim 2 Is Not Made Obvious by Lebensfeld in View of Mathieu Because the Cited References Do Not Disclose the Invention As Claimed

Claim 2, as amended, is directed to a transforming interactive amusement device having a card reader associated with the body.

Lebensfeld discloses a toy object with apparatus for playing a shooting game. The toy object can have input controls, circuitry, and/or a computer to upload and download functions and use information. Lebensfeld does not teach or suggest or cite any references that teach or

suggest a card reader adapted to receive enhancement data from a data storage device and transmit the enhancement data to the microprocessor.

Mathieu fails to remedy the deficiencies of Lebensfeld. The reference discloses a gaming system with two controlled units that transmit and receive infrared signals. Mathieu fails to disclose a card reader adapted to receive enhancement data.

Neither of the references, alone or in combination, teach or suggest, provide any motivation or expectation of success to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide an amusement device having a card reader adapted to receive enhancement data. Neither of the references, alone or in combination, teach or suggest a card reader. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would find no motivation or expectation of success in the cited references, alone or in combination, to provide an amusement device having a card reader.

D. Independent Claim 2 Is Not Made Obvious by Lebensfeld in View of Mathieu Because Lebensfeld Teaches Away from the Combination

Lebensfeld discloses a toy object with apparatus for playing a shooting game. The reference teaches that “[t]here is a need for a *simple*, low cost toy,” and further teaches that interactive toys that “are required to perform interactive tasks under remote control” such as disclosed in U.S. Patent No. 4,938,483 “likely are relatively expensive and may be difficult for younger children to operate.” See Lebensfeld, col. 1, l. 60 – col. 2, l. 19. Lebensfeld, therefore, teaches away from interactive toys that are required to perform interactive tasks under remote control that may be difficult for younger children to operate.

Lebensfeld teaches away from the combination with Mathieu, because Mathieu discloses interactive toys that are required to perform interactive tasks under remote control. The reference discloses a gaming system with two controlled units that transmit and receive infrared signals. The remote controllers require the performance of interactive tasks, because each controller has both directional controls and a fire control. Thus, Lebensfeld teaches away from the combination with Mathieu.

Given that Lebensfeld teaches away from the combination with Mathieu, claim 2 stands in condition for allowance.

E. Independent Claim 3 Is Not Made Obvious by Lebensfeld in View of Mathieu Because the Cited References Do Not Disclose the Invention As Claimed

Claim 3 is directed to an interactive amusement device having a launch mechanism operably coupled to a launchable element.

Lebensfeld teaches a toy object with apparatus for playing a shooting game, wherein the toy object has either an energy emitter, an energy sensor, or both. Lebensfeld does not teach or suggest a device having a launch mechanism or a launch element. In fact, none of the embodiments or alternatives taught in Lebensfeld have any launching capabilities.

Mathieu fails to remedy the deficiencies of Lebensfeld. The reference discloses a gaming system with two controlled units that transmit and receive infrared signals. Mathieu fails to teach or suggest a launch mechanism or a launchable element.

Neither of the references, alone or in combination, teach or suggest, provide any motivation or expectation of success to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide an amusement device having a launch mechanism operably coupled to a launchable element. Neither of the references, alone or in combination, teach or suggest a launch mechanism. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would find no motivation or expectation of success in the cited references, alone or in combination, to provide an amusement device having a launch mechanism operably coupled to a launchable element.

F. Independent Claim 3 Is Not Made Obvious by Lebensfeld in View of Mathieu Because Lebensfeld Teaches Away from the Combination

As described above, Lebensfeld teaches away from interactive toys that are required to perform interactive tasks under remote control that may be difficult for younger children to operate. Thus, Lebensfeld teaches away from the combination with Mathieu, because Mathieu discloses interactive toys that are required to perform interactive tasks under remote control. The reference discloses a gaming system with two controlled units that transmit and receive infrared signals. The remote controllers require the performance of interactive tasks, because each controller has both directional controls and a fire control. Thus, Lebensfeld teaches away from the combination with Mathieu.

Given that Lebensfeld teaches away from the combination with Mathieu, claim 3 stands in condition for allowance.

G. Claim Depending from Claim 3 Is Patentable

Because claim 4 depends directly from claim 3 and incorporates all the limitations of claim 3, the above argument obviates the basis for this ground of rejection. Thus, claim 4 is not made obvious by Lebensfeld in view of Mathieu. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

H. Independent Claim 10 Is Not Made Obvious by Lebensfeld in View of Mathieu Because the Cited References Do Not Disclose the Invention As Claimed

Claim 10, as amended, is directed to an interactive amusement device having a data card reader adapted to receive data from a data card and transmit the data to the microprocessor.

Lebensfeld teaches a toy object with apparatus for playing a shooting game. The toy object can have input controls, circuitry and/or a computer to upload and download functions and use information. Lebensfeld does not disclose a data card reader adapted to receive data from a data card and transmit the data to the microprocessor.

Mathieu fails to remedy the deficiencies of Lebensfeld. The reference discloses a gaming system with two controlled units that transmit and receive infrared signals. Mathieu fails to disclose a data card reader adapted to receive data.

Neither of the references, alone or in combination, teach or suggest, provide any motivation or expectation of success to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide an interactive amusement device having a data card reader adapted to receive data. Neither of the references, alone or in combination, teach or suggest a card reader. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would find no motivation or expectation of success in the cited references, alone or in combination, to provide an interactive amusement device having a data card reader.

I. Independent Claim 10 Is Not Made Obvious by Lebensfeld in View of Mathieu Because Lebensfeld Teaches Away from the Combination

As described above, Lebensfeld teaches away from interactive toys that are required to perform interactive tasks under remote control that may be difficult for younger children to operate. Thus, Lebensfeld teaches away from the combination with Mathieu, because Mathieu discloses interactive toys that are required to perform interactive tasks under remote control. The reference discloses a gaming system with two controlled units that transmit and receive infrared signals. The remote controllers require the performance of interactive tasks, because each

controller has both directional controls and a fire control. Thus, Lebensfeld teaches away from the combination with Mathieu.

Given that Lebensfeld teaches away from the combination with Mathieu, claim 10 stands in condition for allowance.

J. Independent Claim 3 Is Not Made Obvious by Tachau Because the Cited Reference Does Not Disclose the Invention As Claimed

Claim 3 is directed to an interactive amusement device having a launch mechanism operably coupled to a launchable element.

Tachau teaches an interactive toy with bombs or missiles. The “launch” capability taught by the reference is limited to *physically unlatching* or *releasing* the bombs or missiles. That is, Tachau merely discloses a combination of a releasable latch and gravity to allow bombs or missiles to drop off of the interactive toy. Tachau does not teach or suggest a device having a launch mechanism or a launchable element. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would find no motivation or expectation of success in the cited reference, alone or in combination with any other reference, to provide an amusement device having a launch mechanism operably coupled to a launchable element.

K. Claim Depending from Claim 3 Is Patentable

Because claim 4 depends directly from claim 3 and incorporates all the limitations of claim 3, the above argument obviates the basis for this ground of rejection. Thus, claim 4 is not made obvious by Tachau. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

L. Independent Claim 5 Is Not Made Obvious by Simms in View of Gabai Because the Cited References Do Not Disclose the Invention As Claimed

Claim 5, as amended, requires compiling a number of the information carrying cards, wherein the information carrying cards carry game and control information, the control information adapted to actuate an amusement device, and players using the game information against each other to try to achieve victory over other players.

Simms fails to disclose information carrying cards that carry game and control information. Simms discloses wrestling images displayed on playing cards and an apparatus for displaying those images. That is, Simms discloses information carrying cards carrying only game information. Simms does not disclose cards carrying both game and control information.

Gabai fails to remedy the deficiencies of Simms. The reference discloses a wireless computer controlled toy. Gabai fails to disclose information carrying cards carrying game and control information. In fact, Gabai does not teach the use of any cards.

Neither of the references, alone or in combination, teach or suggest, provide any motivation or expectation of success to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide a game method that requires compiling information carrying cards carrying game and control information. Neither of the references, alone or in combination, teach or suggest information carrying cards carrying game and control information. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would find no motivation or expectation of success in the cited references, alone or in combination, to provide a game method that requires compiling information carrying cards that carry game and control information.

M. Claims Depending from Claim 5 Are Patentable

Because claims 7-9 depend directly or indirectly from claim 5 and incorporate all the limitations of claim 5, the above argument obviates the basis for this ground of rejection. Thus, claims 7-9 are not made obvious by Simms in view of Gabai. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

N. Dependent Claim 12 Is Not Made Obvious by Lebensfeld in View of Mathieu and Li Because the Cited References Do Not Disclose the Invention As Claimed

Claim 12, as amended, is directed to an interactive amusement system having a data card reader adapted to receive data from a data card wherein a number of the data cards are configured to be used in a card game.

Lebensfeld teaches a toy object with apparatus for playing a shooting game. Lebensfeld does not teach or suggest data cards configured to be used in a card game.

Mathieu fails to remedy the deficiencies of Lebensfeld. The reference discloses a gaming system with two controlled units that transmit and receive infrared signals. Mathieu fails to teach or suggest data cards configured to be used in a card game.

Li fails to remedy the deficiencies of Lebensfeld and Mathieu. Li discloses an audio device and control cards with identification labels that connect with a control circuit in the audio device to control a memory module to output digitized audio data. Li does not teach or suggest data cards configured to be used in a card game.

None of the references, alone or in combination, teach or suggest, provide any motivation or expectation of success to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide an interactive amusement system having a data card reader adapted to receive data from a data card wherein a number of the data cards are configured to be used in a card game. None of the references, alone or in combination, teach or suggest data cards configured to be used in a card game. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would find no motivation or expectation of success in the cited references, alone or in combination, to provide an interactive amusement system having data cards that are configured to be used in a card game.

VI. Conclusion

Applicants have obviated, by expressing a conditional willingness to file terminal disclaimers, the provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejections of claims 1-2 and 10. Applicants have also obviated by amendment in *Hornsby II* the provisional statutory double patenting rejection. Applicants further have obviated by amendment the indefiniteness rejections of claims 5, 7-9, and 12. In addition, Applicants have obviated by amendment and argument the anticipation rejections of claims 1, 5, and 7-9. Finally, Applicants have obviated by amendment and argument the obviousness rejections of claims 2-5, 7-10, and 12. Applicants have canceled claims 6 and 11 without prejudice and added new claims 13-21 to more fully claim the present invention.

A petition for a three-month extension of time to respond (from November 9, 2002 – February 9, 2003) is enclosed herewith, along with a check in the amount of \$591, \$465 of which to cover the fee associated with the petition, and \$126 of which to cover the extra claims fee. The Office is also hereby authorized to charge any additional fees associated with this communication or the petition to Deposit Account 04-1420.

Consequently, claims 1-5, 7-10, and 12-21 are allowable. Reconsideration and a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP

Date:

January 28, 2003

By:

David E. Bruhn

David E. Bruhn
Reg. No. 36,762
Suite 1500
50 South Sixth Street
Minneapolis, MN 55402-1498
(612) 340-6317

MARKED-UP VERSION SHOWING CHANGES**IN THE CLAIMS**

Cancel claims 6 and 11.

1. (amended) An amusement device comprising:

a body;

features carried by the body;

armor [detachably]carried by the body and protecting at least a portion of the body, the armor adapted to be detachable during normal use of the amusement device;

means for powering the device and at least some of the features, said means for powering carried by the body;

means for communicating information to the device comprising:

means for holding information, said means for holding discrete from the device, and

means for receiving information, said means for receiving carried by the body; and

a microprocessor operably coupled to the means for powering and means for receiving.

2. (amended) A transforming interactive amusement device comprising:

(a) a body;

(b) at least two transport elements moveably connected to the body;

(c) at least two arms moveably connected to the body;

(d) a motor associated with the body, the motor operably coupled to the at least two transport elements;

(e) a microprocessor operably coupled to the motor, the microprocessor being adapted to command the motor to perform an action;

(f) a [data]card reader[-writer] associated with the body, the [data]card reader[-writer] adapted to receive enhancement data from a data storage device and transmit the enhancement data to the microprocessor, wherein the enhancement data enhances a function of the device;

(g) a wireless receiver associated with the body, the wireless receiver adapted to receive a wireless communication and transmit the wireless communication to the microprocessor;

(h) a unit wireless transmitter associated with the body, the unit wireless transmitter operably coupled with the microprocessor and capable of wireless communication with a second interactive amusement device; and

(i) a remote wireless transmitter operably coupled by wireless communication with the wireless receiver; wherein

(j) the device transforms into at least two different forms.

5. (amended) A game method using a number of information carrying cards, wherein the game comprises the steps of:

[building a "battle" deck comprising] compiling a number of the information carrying cards, wherein the information carrying cards carry game and control information, the control information adapted to actuate an amusement device;

distributing the cards to players; and

players using the game information against each other to try to achieve victory over other players.

7. (amended) The game according to claim [6]5, wherein the amusement devices act according to the control information carried on a card.

8. (amended) The game according to claim 7, wherein the amusement device[s] also acts in association with the games being played with the information carrying cards[cards].

10. (amended) An interactive amusement system capable of [a]performing at least two functions and comprising:

- (a) a body;
- (b) a motor associated with the body;
- (c) a microprocessor operably coupled to the motor, the microprocessor being adapted to command the motor to perform an action;
- (d) a wireless receiver associated with the body, the wireless receiver adapted to receive a wireless communication and transmit the wireless communication to the microprocessor;
- (e) a unit wireless transmitter associated with the body, the unit wireless transmitter operably coupled with the microprocessor and capable of wireless communication with a second interactive amusement device;[and]
- (f) a remote wireless transmitter operably coupled by wireless communication with the wireless receiver[.]; and

(g) a data card reader associated with the body, the data card reader adapted to receive data from a data card and transmit the data to the microprocessor, wherein the data provides for changing the at least two functions, the changes being selected from the group consisting of:

- (1) changed number of functions; and
- (2) changed speed of functions.

12. (amended) The interactive amusement system according to claim [11]10, [further comprising a card game, wherein the card game is played using]wherein a number of the data cards are configured to be used in a card game.

13. (new) The interactive amusement device of claim 10, further comprising a control switch associated with the body, the control switch being configured to actuate at least one of the at least two functions.

14. (new) The interactive amusement device of claim 13, wherein the control switch is configured to shut down the amusement device.

15. (new) A game method comprising:

(a) providing at least two information cards to each of at least two players, wherein the at least two information cards have card game information and device actuation information, the device actuation information configured to actuate an amusement device; and

(b) the at least two players using the card game information to compete in a card game.

16. (new) The game method of claim 15 wherein the card game information is displayed on a face of each of the at least two information cards.

17. (new) An interactive amusement device comprising:

- (a) a body;
- (b) a launchable element associated with the body;
- (c) a launch mechanism associated with the body, the launch mechanism configured to propel the launchable element away from the body; and
- (d) a motor operably coupled to the launch mechanism; wherein selective actuation of the motor launches the launchable element.

18. (new) The game method of claim 17 further comprising a data card reader associated with the body, the data card reader configured to receive data from a data card wherein the data is configured to add a function to the interactive amusement device.

19. (new) The game method of claim 18 wherein the data is configured to enhance an existing function of the interactive amusement device.

20. (new) A transformable interactive amusement device, comprising:

- (a) a body;
- (b) a motor associated with the body;

(c) a microprocessor operably coupled to the motor, the microprocessor configured to actuate the motor to propel an action;

(d) a data card reader configured to read a data card whereby the microprocessor is actuated; and

(e) at least two moveable elements moveably coupled to the body, the at least two moveable elements operably coupled to the motor, wherein the body and the at least two moveable elements are reconfigurable whereby the device is transformable.

21. (new) The device of claim 20, further comprising at least two couplings configured to couple the at least two moveable elements to the body, wherein the at least two couplings are configured to allow the body and the at least two moveable elements to be reconfigurable.